

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3-18 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 15 and 16 have been amended to better define the claimed invention. New claims 17-18 readable on the elected invention/species have been added to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are believed entitled. The amended claims find solid support in the original specification, e.g., page 7 the last line. New claims 17-18 include the limitations of original claims 11 and 12, respectively. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The new ground of rejection relying on *Vegas*, which is a manual of a multi-track multimedia editing program, is noted. Applicants have carefully reviewed the portions of *Vegas* cited by the Examiner and briefly scanned the remainder of the lengthy reference, but are not convinced that the reference is at all relevant to the disclosed embodiments of the present invention. Notwithstanding the above, Applicants have further narrowed the independent claims solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution to specifically avoid the Examiner's rejections.

In particular, independent claim 1 now includes the limitation that "the interactive multimedia contents outputted in the file form are readable and re-editable by the editorial information processing unit." The added claim feature finds support in the specification at page 7, the last line. Thus, the claimed invention now requires storing/outputting the interactive multimedia contents in a file form for later re-edition. The closest teaching of *Vegas* appears to be page 325, at Vegas EDL.txt which is a text version of event placements for use by an outside studio to recreate the authored/edited movie from the source media files. Thus, the best *Vegas* can do is to recreate the authored/edited movie based on a text file storing event placements. The reference does not teach or suggest to re-edit the authored/edited contents, contrary to the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the applied art of record.

Independent claims 15 and 16 have been amended similarly to claim 1, and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons.

The dependent claims are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to the respective independent claims. At least claims 11 and 12 are also patentable on their own merits since these claims recite other features neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by the applied art, as will be apparent to the Examiner upon reviewing these claims.

In particular, claim 11 recites that “the file input and output processor further contains a form converting module for performing the form conversion between the internal material structure and the input and output form,” which is neither disclosed, taught nor suggested by *Vegas*, especially in the portions cited by the Examiner.

As to claim 12, the reference clearly fails to teach or suggest that “the form converting module changes a higher level authoring result to a lower level authoring result when the editing and authoring tool provides the higher and lower level authoring, and converts the edited and authored contents to the higher level file form which is not supported by the editing and authoring tool.” The claim feature finds support in the specification, at page 11, lines 15-21. Applicants have carefully reviewed the portions cited by the Examiner but were unable to locate any teaching of the above highlighted features. *Vegas* does not fairly teach or suggest, at least, converting the authoring result from a *high level to a low level* as presently claimed. The reference is also silent on whether the *Vegas* software would convert the edited and authored contents to the higher level file form which is not supported by the editing and authoring tool or not.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 12 are separately patentable over the applied art of record.

New claims 17-18 include limitations similar to those of claims 11-12, respectively, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons.

Each of the Examiner’s rejections has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/

Yoon S. Ham

Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 2, 2007